REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending with this paper. Claims 1-18 stand rejected by this Office Action.

The Office Action acknowledges the Supplemental IDS filed on June 10, 2004 and the preliminary amendment that amends the title to "A Runtime Program Analysis Tool for a Simulation Engine". The Office Action also acknowledges acceptance of the drawings.

Priority

The Office Action acknowledges the Applicant's claim for priority based on US Application No. 09/218,945 filed on December 22, 1998.

Claim Objections

Claims 6-9 and 15-18 are objected to because of informalities. Regarding claim 6, the Applicants are replacing "on a" with "based on". Regarding claims 7 and 16, the Applicants are replacing "to a" with "to". Regarding claims 8, 9, 15, 17, and 18, the Applicants are replacing "on a" with "on".

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-18 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over International Patent No. WO 97/44766 A1 (Cook) in view of "DDD – A free Graphical Front-End for Unix Debuggers" (Zeller).

Regarding claim 1, the Applicants are amending the claim to include the feature of "matching a profile against a simulation domain, wherein the profile comprises a set of criteria **and identifies a desired aspect for a current simulation task.**" (Emphasis added.) The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed. For example, the present patent application discloses (Page 9, lines 25-31. Emphasis added.):

> Specifically, a profile is a set of criteria that is matched against the domain. The purpose of a profile is to check whether the criteria defined by the profile is met in the domain. Using a visual editing tool, instructional designers create profiles to **identify those things that are important to know about the domain for a given task.** During execution of a BusSim application at the point that feedback is

-6-

requested either by the student or pro-actively by the application, the set of profiles associated with the current task are evaluated to determine which ones are true. Example profiles include: Good productions strategy but wrong Break-Even Formula; Good driving record and low claims history; and Correct Cash Flow Analysis but poor Return on Investment (ROI).

The combination of Cook and Zeller fails to teach or even suggest the feature of "matching a profile against a simulation domain, wherein the profile comprises a set of criteria and identifies a desired aspect for a current simulation task." Cook does disclose (Page 70, lines 13-20.):

> A second step in input judging can be classification of a suitable input in standard error categories. In an exemplary embodiment, this can be performed by providing a pattern corresponding to a correct answer. The patterns can be a template appropriate to a correct answer. The patterns can be a template appropriate to a suitable input, such as a text template or a spatial template. A pattern matching procedure selected from a system library of such procedures can be executed to match the input to the pattern.

Cook merely discloses matching a user input to a pattern that corresponds to a correct answer. Cook further discloses patterns with templates such as text templates and spatial patterns but fails to identify a desired aspect for a current simulation task. Moreover, Zeller fails to remedy the deficiencies of Cook.

Moreover, the combination of Cook and Zeller fails to teach or even suggest the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal and providing feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal, **wherein the feedback is in accordance with the profile,** (Emphasis added.) The Office Action alleges that Cook teaches "monitoring progress toward the goal and providing feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 10, lines 24-31), wherein the feedback is in accordance with the profile (page 70, lines 3-8)". Cook does disclose (Page 70, lines 1-8. Emphasis added.):

> Thereby, the agent can monitor the student's pedagogic characteristics in a uniform fashion across all standardized materials. Accordingly, a first step in input judging can be, where appropriate, checking the data type and perhaps range of an input. For example, checking that a fraction is entered in response to a fraction addition problem. Appropriate feedback can be given if the wrong data type or range is input.

-7-

Amendment dated June 1, 2005   Application No. 09/868,664
Response to Office Action dated 03/15/05

As taught by Cook, feedback is provided in accordance with a profile that merely checks whether the data type and range of input data are wrong and <u>not</u> with a profile that identifies a desired aspect for a current simulation task. Moreover, Zeller fails to remedy the deficiencies of Cook.

Similarly, the Applicants are amending claim 10 to include "logic that matches a profile against a simulation domain, wherein the profile comprises a set of criteria and identifies a desired aspect for a current simulation task" and "logic that monitors progress toward the goal and provides feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal, wherein the feedback is in accordance with the profile." Thus, claim 10 is patentable for at least the above reasons.

Claims 2-9 and 11-18 ultimately depend from independent claims 1 and 10, respectfully, and are patentable for at least the above reasons. The Applicants request reconsideration of claims 1-18.

New Claims

The Applicants are adding claims 19 and 20, which are supported by the specification as originally filed (e.g., page 9, lines 3-31 and page 9, lines 32-34 respectively.)

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 1, 2005

Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001

-8-